

her own Conservative Senator said that something must be done. When she starts giving us answers to those matters, then we will all cheer on all sides of the House.

**Miss MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, throughout the discussion that has taken place with regard to job creation and training, there has been no one who has said more consistently than I that it is not enough. Yes, we are pleased with the fact that 580,000 new jobs have been created in the last 16 months, but it is not enough. That is why we have the Canadian Jobs Strategy and why we are announcing new programs in this Budget, programs for the people who need them most, our older workers and those on social assistance. These initiatives are being taken and I would ask the Hon. Member to study them.

I do want to say that of those 580,000 new jobs, 81 per cent are full time. In the last administration, of the number of jobs created in that four-year period, only 18 per cent were full time. That is a tremendous difference. We are moving in the right direction.

The Hon. Member talks about lapses and not being able to put programs into effect in time. I must tell you, Sir, that lapses are part of the normal Government operation. The Member who was a Minister should recognize that. What he should also recognize is that during the height of the recession, when unemployment was higher in Canada than at any time since the Depression, the Liberal Government lapsed \$650 million in the Department of Employment and Immigration.

The Hon. Member also mentioned the long-term unemployed and the fact that their number has increased since 1981. Indeed, I agree with him. It has increased since 1981. But all of that increase took place between 1981 and 1983. The numbers are there for the Hon. Member to see.

Since January 1983, the number of Canadians unemployed for one year or more was then 292,000. In January, 1984, the number was 309,000. In January, 1985, the number dropped to 299,000 and in January, 1986, it again dropped to 245,000. The trend is in the right direction, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Mitchell:** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald). I think she has been doing a good job.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Mitchell:** I hope we are not going to get into a partisan debate back and forth. We all want many more opportunities for Canadians. I would like our target to be full employment. There has been a considerable improvement in the rate of employment, but in my province of British Columbia the situation is still pretty serious.

● (1150)

This is International Women's Week and I know the Minister is very committed to equal opportunity for women. I would like to ask her two or three questions about the Canada Jobs

*The Budget—Hon. F. MacDonald*

Strategy. I hope she will answer in a way that will help us learn how we can adapt this program considerably more to the needs of women. Figures from the Canadian Congress on Learning Opportunities for Women indicate that the percentage of women enrolled in Government-sponsored training programs has decreased steadily since 1979 during the Liberal regime. In 1984-85 the figure was only 18 per cent, which is still low. Why can we not have a very positive affirmative action program to achieve a 50 per cent rate of women in training programs?

There is concern because the Canadian Jobs Strategy lumps youth and women together in the job entry and re-entry program, although their situations are different. For example, you must have been out of the labour force for three years in order to qualify. That is not adapted to the needs of women who are phased out of federal programs or who are impacted upon by technological changes and need retraining. Why do we not have a separate focus on the special needs of women?

There is also concern that training allowances are at inadequate, low levels which seem to assume that the women have a provider. The levels are simply not adequate for women who are looking for training in their own right and, in many cases, have children to support. I know there has been some increase in subsidies for child care, but there is still concern that the women will not earn enough to live on while supporting kids.

There is also a concern that there is a trend to providing training money for private colleges. The private colleges are really not able to give the same kind of high quality training, and often their tuition rates are higher. Why are we not focussing on beefing up vocational training in public institutions which have been unfairly cut back on?

Those are the questions I have. Why can we not have a 50 per cent target rate for women? Why can we not design the program to better suit women? Why can we not have better training allowances suited to women, particularly those who are heads of families? Why can we not beef up government-subsidized training programs rather than private training institutions?

**Miss MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for her questions. All of those issues deserve to be very seriously addressed. I will first address the question of whether the ratio of women in job creation and training programs can be 50 per cent.

In the programs under the Canadian Jobs Strategy there is now an emphasis on the inclusion of women and minority groups such as disabled persons, native people, and visible minorities. We are seeing some improvement over the six-month period. Difficulty arises in that we have had a number of programs, particularly training programs, built into the system. They are not part of the Canadian Jobs Strategy, but are part of the on-going community college training through Manpower training programs, and have been primarily dominated by apprenticeship programs.

Only 4 per cent of the people enrolled in the apprenticeship programs are women. It is basic to everything that we begin to